United Nations E/C.12/2018/SR.51

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
18 October 2018

Original: English

Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
Sixty-fourth session

Summary record of the 51st meeting*
Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Tuesday, 9 October 2018, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Ms. Bras Gomes

Contents

Substantive issues arising from the implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (*continued*)

Day of general discussion on a draft general comment on article 15 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

* No summary record was issued for the 50th meeting.

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of the present record to the Documents Management Section (DMS-DCM@un.org).

Any corrected records of the public meetings of the Committee at this session will be reissued for technical reasons after the end of the session.

GE.18-16936 (E) 181018 181018

1816936

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Substantive issues arising from the implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (*continued*)

Day of general discussion on a draft general comment on article 15 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

1. **The Chair** said that during the day of general discussion, the Committee was keen to continue its exploration of the issues that ought to be included in its planned draft general comment on article 15 of the Covenant, including the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications. The day would consist of four panel sessions. The panel discussions would be facilitated by Mr. Mancisidor de la Fuente and by Mr. Uprimny.

Panel 1: Normative contents

2. **Mr. Mancisidor de la Fuente** (Facilitator for panel 1) said that the Committee had decided to draft a general comment on article 15 in order to provide guidance regarding its understanding of the article and its expectations from States parties in terms of their reporting on its implementation. The aim of the day of general discussion was to examine in detail the scope of the article in order to achieve two objectives, namely to enrich the Committee's internal discussions with the knowledge and information presented by the speakers and to involve a wider range of stakeholders in the drafting process. Much of the groundwork had already been laid through the organization of a number of seminars and workshops with other entities. Hopefully, following the day of general discussion the Committee would be in a position to consider a draft text at its sixty-fifth session, with a view to adopting the general comment at its sixty-sixth session.

3. **Mr. Tararas** (Panellist, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)) said that much progress had been made since the adoption of the Venice Statement on the Right to Enjoy the Benefits of Scientific Progress and its Applications in 2009. The Committee's adoption of a general comment on the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress would help in moving enjoyment of that right to the centre of the Committee's work.

4. The Constitution of UNESCO highlighted the connection between the promotion of scientific cooperation and peace, and in particular the importance of ensuring that peace was rooted in the intellectual solidarity of humankind. The Organization had adopted a comprehensive approach that took account of the links between science, cultural communication and information. The term "technoscience" suitably encompassed the great advancements occurring in the domain, advancements which often raised new fears in the minds of the general public, particularly with regard to the possible misuse or abuse of new technologies. It was important to bear in mind the divide between academics, society and decision makers, the imbalances that existed between countries and the tensions between public and private considerations.

5. Article 15 of the Covenant had been adopted largely on the basis of a proposal put forward by UNESCO during the discussions held by the Commission on Human Rights in the 1950s. With the adoption of the UNESCO Strategy on Human Rights in 2003, the Organization had recognized that very little had been done to explore the normative content of the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress. It was important to bear in mind the connection between that right and the implementation of article 2 (1) of the Covenant, and also between it and the implementation of many other rights in the Covenant and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Venice Statement had acknowledged the tensions between the protection of intellectual property rights and the implementation of the right to enjoy the benefits of that property. When article 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights — which formed the basis of the Organization's work — and article 15 (1) (b) of the Covenant had been drafted, those two aspects had not been seen as incompatible.

6. The normative work of the Organization in the areas of bioethics and ethics in science and technology was rooted in the Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights and the Recommendation on Science and Scientific Researchers, which

acknowledged the role of science in promoting the greater good, an aspect which was absent in article 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and article 15 of the Covenant. In the area of ethics, UNESCO was making efforts to define the optimum conditions for sharing the benefits of scientific research, including by promoting the sharing of scientific data and knowledge, bridging knowledge gaps, determining how the governance of science ought to be conducted, identifying key policy priorities and encouraging the active participation of citizens.

7. Other elements of the Organization's work that were relevant to the Committee's consideration of its draft general comment included efforts to bring down the barriers faced by women in the sciences, examine the concept of open access and the related implications and encourage a rights-based approach to addressing access to the Internet.

8. It was important to recall the broader context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which offered a key opportunity for the advancement of the right to scientific benefits. Other areas where more work was needed included defining the relationship between trade, intellectual property, society and the sharing of scientific benefits and adopting an integrated approach to ensure that sustainability and the impact of scientific developments on the environment were taken into account.

9. **Ms. Wyndham** (Panellist, American Association for the Advancement of Science) said that, since 2010, the American Association for the Advancement of Science had undertaken to gather the perspectives of the scientific and engineering communities in order to inform the work of the United Nations on defining the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress. Through its research within the global community of scientists, engineers and health professionals, the Association had sought to identify the steps States could take to support the advancement of the work done by those groups.

10. The right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress should encompass both material and non-material benefits, such as knowledge. Non-material benefits of scientific progress included contributions to further scientific inquiry and to inclusion and effective citizenship. Indeed, those benefits had been identified by delegates, along with benefits in terms of health, during the drafting of the Covenant, and in article 15 itself a distinction was made between the benefits of scientific progress and the application of such progress. Scientific knowledge could be applied in intangible ways, such as in forming the basis of laws and policies. The actions of individuals were often driven in part, perhaps subconsciously, by an understanding of the scientific underpinnings of a given issue. Scientific progress was in itself the foundation of continued scientific discovery. The content of the periodic reports submitted to the Committee by States parties showed that Governments interpreted the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress as including non-material benefits.

11. The right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and the application thereof ought to include an obligation for Governments to consider and apply the best scientific knowledge in transparent, evidence-based decision-making processes.

12. For science to flourish and contribute to the needs of society, scientists must enjoy freedom of thought. They must be allowed to seek, receive and impart information and ideas, to form and join professional societies and associations and to collaborate with others, both within and outside their own countries. While government regulation of science was sometimes driven by political or other motivations, self-regulation through codes of ethical practice and social responsibility sometimes had its own limitations.

13. The scientific ecosystem was dynamic. It had various components that must inform regulation, including the provision of quality scientific education at all levels of schooling, a recognition of the role of professional associations in promoting a culture of scientific responsibility, and, where necessary, well-defined, unified and consistent legislative steps to regulate scientific freedom.

14. **Ms. Bettzieche** (Panellist, German Institute for Human Rights) said that, in May 2018, the German Institute for Human Rights had hosted formal consultations with experts in natural and social sciences, humanities, mathematics and law in order to examine the challenges in scientific fields in Germany, including the areas in need of regulation, possible pathways to guaranteeing access for all to the benefits of scientific progress and

measures that could be taken to protect the intellectual and material interests of researchers. Interestingly, some experts in the field of natural science did not recognize that there was a link between their work and human rights. In that respect, the Committee's planned general comment would be useful to the scientific community, as well as to States parties.

15. There was a clear need to raise awareness of the Covenant, and specifically of article 15, within the scientific community. Efforts should be made to define the precise meaning of participation in science. During the consultations that her institute had held in Berlin, some experts had noted that information was a precondition for participation, but that access to information was often particularly problematic for scientists in the global South. Funding for access to the benefits of science was a concern, and there was a need for clear and pragmatic guidelines on States parties' obligations in the area of the right to science. Other questions that merited consideration included the digital divide, the meaning of academic freedom and the roles of stakeholders. The draft general comment should address discrimination not only against women, but also against vulnerable groups.

16. The definition of science as "knowledge that is testable and refutable", used by the former Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights, Ms. Farida Shaheed, had been driven by the anglophone understanding of the word. However, in most European languages, science was understood to encompass natural science, mathematics, social science and humanities. Technology and technological developments should also be included. At the consultations, some experts had proposed that the field should be defined as the use of hermeneutic skills to interpret texts and thinking with the aim of intersubjective understanding. Intersubjective verification was critical; results ought to be explainable and replicable. It was important for the general comment to encompass all forms of science and to establish an ethical, rights-based framework for consideration of the issue.

17. **Mr. Gran** (Panellist, Case Western Reserve University), accompanying his statement with a digital slide presentation, said that in the area of the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress, indicators could be used to conduct situational analyses, inform public policy, monitor progress and measure performance and outcomes. Indicators were a useful tool for addressing discrimination in all its forms, whether formal or substantive, direct or indirect. Data from research on the number of people with access to the Internet or to non-subscription scientific journals could be helpful to the Committee in the drafting of its general comment. Other statistical data that might be of interest included the number of countries with legislation in place to prohibit unethical medical trials and the number of countries with an established national ethics committee. Data was being gathered on green technologies, health and education. Such information could be analysed through the lens of the Covenant.

18. **Mr. Vermeir** (Global Young Academy) said that the characterizations of science proposed by the Committee ought to be developed further. It was important for the Committee to take into account the perspectives of young scientists, who often faced age-based discrimination, a lack of resources, limited access to scientific developments and materials and barriers to participation in conferences and publication of articles. It was becoming increasingly difficult to distinguish between fake and genuine science. Researchers often faced difficulties in obtaining visas to pursue science-related opportunities in other countries.

19. In developing the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress, it was important to form alliances with movements that were working to address accessibility issues. The right was sometimes misappropriated. For example, the Global Alliance for Genomics and Health had argued that the scientific community had a right to benefit from citizens' data, rather than citizens having a right to benefit from science.

20. **Ms. Walker** (RightsTech Women) said that the benefits, both material and non-material, of scientific progress and its applications were far-reaching and had had a positive impact on the economies of high-income countries. Science could be distinguished from other forms of knowledge by its openness to international public scrutiny, re-examination and peer review. It was, by its very nature, an international, dynamic conversation.

21. It was important for the Committee's planned general comment on the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress to include specific reference to the issues facing women and girls in the area of science, such as access to science education, science-based employment and equal pay. Harmful stereotypes needed to be eliminated in order to ensure that women and girls were better able to enjoy their right to participate in directing the course of science and human progress.

22. Her organization recommended that international rights-based cooperation should be increased in order to reduce inequalities among people and nations and to ensure the equal enjoyment by women and girls of the rights enshrined in article 15. It further recommended that science education should be developed in tandem with human rights education, and that targeted measures should be implemented to eliminate direct and indirect discrimination against women and girls in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM).

23. **Mr. Lador** (Earthjustice) said that, in developing its general comment, the Committee should consider that the perceptions of science had shifted since the drafting of the Covenant and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Society now viewed science less positively, and even as a source of anxiety. For environmental organizations, the prevalence of both expertise and counter-expertise meant that it was important to allow access to scientific debate from different perspectives rather than relying on an authoritarian approach, while alternative sources of knowledge, such as the knowledge of indigenous peoples, were crucial for sustainability and now had a positive role to play. Another problem was that of corporate capture. It was necessary to guarantee freedom of research as a defence against the growing influence of private interests over scientific decisions. Lastly, he invited the Committee to consider the danger of dependence on complex technical systems and to recognize that instruments such as the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (the Aarhus Convention) highlighted the obligation of States to ensure the right to information.

24. **Mr. Fernández Puyana** (University for Peace), drawing the Committee's attention to the recently published book, *History of Peace in the West*, said that its chapter on science as an instrument for peace contained comments attributed to Albert Einstein. Einstein had written that "the natural scientist responds to pacifist aims because of the universal nature of his subject and his dependence on international cooperation". After the Second World War, he had said that "we have paid an awful price to learn [...] that living and working together can be done in one way only — under law. Unless it prevails, and unless by common struggle we are capable of new ways of thinking mankind is doomed." By developing article 15 through the drafting of a general comment, the Committee would lay the foundations for a more peaceful world in which science would play a crucial role.

25. **Ms. Post** (Netherlands) said that the future general comment should highlight the importance of the concept of open science, which created an enabling environment for the enjoyment of the rights to science and scientific development. As a matter of principle, it was important that publicly funded research should benefit society and that results should be made freely available to the extent possible. Open science offered sizeable benefits for citizens, the business and scientific communities and society as a whole, potentially all over the world.

26. **Mr. Nuño García** (Spain) said that article 15 of the Covenant should be read in conjunction with article 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, concerning the right of everyone to share in scientific advancement and its benefits. General comments were useful tools which advanced the understanding of the scope and implications of obligations assumed by States parties. In that sense, the general comment should identify the obligations stemming from the conservation, the development and the diffusion of science, as outlined in article 15 (2) of the Covenant, and should also include guidance for States parties on achieving equality between women and men, on enjoying the benefits of scientific progress and on participating in scientific work. There was also a need to clearly distinguish science from pseudoscience in order to protect citizens from the dangers that might arise from confusion between the two.

27. **Mr. Tararas** (Panellist, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that the Committee might examine the Recommendation on Science and Scientific Researchers of UNESCO, which contained provisions asking member States to ensure equal opportunities for all citizens to initial education, to abolish inequalities of opportunities, to remediate past inequalities and patterns of exclusion, to encourage the spirit of service to the advancement of science and to social and ecological responsibilities and to ensure equitable and open access to scientific literature, data and contents. Given that international cooperation was particularly important for the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications because of the very nature of science, with non-State actors having a dominant role in the development of scientific research and ownership of the results, it was advisable to study how the specific provisions of the Covenant might be applied to explore and advance such cooperation. Lastly, he drew attention to the importance of capacity-building to make it possible for member States to create the right infrastructure for research, science and education, ultimately allowing citizens to reap the benefits.

28. **Mr. Pedernera Reyna** (Committee on the Rights of the Child) said that the Committee on the Rights of the Child welcomed the initiative to draft a general comment and recognized that there was an intersection between children's rights and economic, social and cultural rights in the area of science and technology. His Committee had identified a constant tension between technological development and the protection of the rights of the child. For example, the medical advance of surrogate motherhood had raised significant questions. Nevertheless, children were privileged actors in the development of new technologies and, therefore, the Committee was planning to develop a general comment on digital technologies and the rights of the child. He invited the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights to participate in that work.

29. **Ms. Wyndham** (Panellist, American Association for the Advancement of Science) said that, to realize the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress, all citizens needed to be able to access scientific information and required basic education in the STEM subjects in order to understand the scientific information that they received throughout their lives. Women and girls needed to be able to access STEM education so that they could become scientists, as diversity in the scientific workforce contributed additional benefits. Human subjects participating in scientific research should be diverse as well so that the benefits of science might be extended to all members of society. She commended the Committee for its efforts to further the realization of the right to benefit from scientific progress by developing guidance for States parties and civil society.

30. **Ms. Bettzieche** (Panellist, German Institute for Human Rights) said that the proposed general comment should include examples of good practice so that States parties could clearly understand their obligations and other stakeholders could hold them accountable. Even if the general comment did not include a precise definition of science, terms such as "science", "scientific progress", "scientific knowledge" and "scientific tradition" should be carefully reviewed, in the interests of clarity.

31. **Mr. Gran** (Panellist, Case Western Reserve University) said that the development of indicators on aspects such as access to scientific literature, international cooperation and the role of non-State actors presented a particular set of challenges. He welcomed the comments made by the member of the Committee on the Rights of the Child and said that his own work was aimed at producing information disaggregated by factors such as gender and age; it focused especially on young people.

The meeting was suspended at 11.50 a.m. and resumed at noon.

Panel 2: Relationship with other rights

32. **Mr. Uprimny** (Facilitator for panel 2) said that the aim of panel 2 was to explore the strong interrelationship between the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications and other human rights, considering that science was an instrument that could both advance and endanger other rights. For that reason, other parts of the Covenant too referred to science, including article 11, which mentioned the contribution of scientific knowledge to the production, conservation and distribution of food.

33. **Ms. Bidault** (Panellist, Observatoire de la diversité et des droits culturels) said that international instruments and monitoring mechanisms contained many indications that the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress was a cultural right. For example, the right was mentioned in the Human Rights Council resolutions establishing the mandate of the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights. The Committee itself, in its general comment No. 21 on the right of everyone to take part in cultural life, had provided a broad definition of culture that included "methods of production or technology". Moreover, the former Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights, Farida Shaheed, had reported that "cultural rights protect the rights for each person [...] to develop and express their world view and the meanings they give to their existence and their development through, inter alia, values, beliefs, convictions, languages, knowledge and the arts, institutions and ways of life". Knowledge therefore carried the same weight as beliefs and convictions in allowing people to construct their identity and world view. According to the Special Rapporteur, realizing the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and their applications — as with other cultural rights — depended on "ensuring the necessary conditions for all to continuously engage in critical thinking about themselves and the world they inhabit, and to have the opportunity and the wherewithal to interrogate, investigate and contribute new knowledge with ideas, expressions and innovative applications, regardless of frontiers". Such conditions necessarily included access to the domain of science.

34. Given that the Committee had already issued general comments Nos. 17 and 21 on the implementation of rights protected by articles 15 (1) (a) and 15 (1) (c) of the Covenant, she believed that the future general comment should take those instruments into consideration, while specifically focusing on the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress. As science encompassed a great variety of disciplines and traditions, the Committee should adopt a broad definition that would include the social sciences and all forms of research, and it should not hesitate to refer to "scientific diversity". It might also refer to "cultures" and "sciences" in the plural in order to better reflect that diversity. She warned against inclusion of the term "right to science", as used in the 2012 report of the Special Rapporteur (A/HRC/20/26), which did not fully convey the meaning of the right in question. Instead, the Committee should adopt specific language referring to people's access to, participation in and contribution to science. In more general terms, the Committee might refer to "the right to take part in scientific life", which better reflected the nature of the right and mirrored the existing wording on "the right to take part in cultural life". The right to take part in scientific life did not mean that everyone should become a scientific researcher. In spirit, it meant that all people should be able to draw on scientific resources, knowledge and heritage within their domains, alone or with others, to achieve their personal aspirations and self-development.

35. **Ms. Porsdam** (Panellist, University of Copenhagen) said that the right to education and the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress were cultural rights, with implications both at the level of individuals and groups, and also at the level of society. For individuals, cultural rights were gateway rights that played a role in realizing all other human rights; they were transformative and empowering, and they enabled the aspiration to a better future. The relationship between education and cultural rights was extremely strong. As the former Secretary-General of the United Nations, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, had once observed, there could be no enjoyment of cultural rights without a minimum of education. Indeed, the UNESCO report, Cultural Rights as Human Rights, published in 1970, indicated that "in the developing world the right to culture is in substance the right to education". The importance of the right to education had been underscored by Malala Yousafzai, who upon receiving the 2014 Nobel Peace Prize had said that "education is one of the blessings of life — and one of its necessities", while drawing attention to the importance of scientific learning. Furthermore, Farida Shaheed had suggested that education played a key role in nurturing people's ability to aspire, which was an important cultural capability that must be supported and developed.

36. In respect of the benefits of the rights to education and science for society as a whole, she drew attention to the 2018 joint report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence and the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide (A/HRC/37/65), which had highlighted the importance of educational reform in preventing genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing

and crimes against humanity. In her recent report, the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights, Karima Bennoune, had touched on the tensions between the right to education and science on the one hand, and the right to religion on the other. There was a need to strike a balance between the right to a religious education and scientific explanations. The Committee might refer to the criteria set forth in article 4 of the Covenant, which established that economic, social and cultural rights might be limited for the purpose of promoting the general welfare within a democratic society, considering that access to knowledge benefited both individuals, through the right to education, and society, by eliminating ignorance and illiteracy and creating a well-informed citizenry. The right to religion was not absolute. It might be restricted in order to protect human rights principles or the rights and well-being of others.

37. Public trust in science had declined as a result of populism, fake news and the deliberate presentation of falsehood as fact. Hopefully, the new general comment on the right to science would highlight the importance of academic and scientific freedom, the value of scientific inquiry and evidence-based policymaking and the need to avoid unethical science.

38. **Ms. Bhave** (Panellist, RightsTech Women) said that women accounted for just 28.8 per cent of STEM researchers at the global level and that they were more likely to graduate in areas related to education, health and welfare. In view of the general shortage of workers with STEM skills, and considering that such skills would be invaluable for the future workforce and that having more women working in STEM fields increased productivity, there was a pressing need to address and reduce the impact of women's underrepresentation. It was clear that the objective of article 3 of the Covenant, on the equal right of men and women to the enjoyment of all economic, social and cultural rights, was not being fulfilled. She was also concerned about the fulfilment of the aims of articles 6 and 13, regarding the rights to work and to education, respectively. The lack of women in STEM professions reflected factors such as their non-advancement through the education pipeline and discrimination at work owing to their family or reproductive situations. There was also a need to address the violation of the right of women to the enjoyment of just and favourable conditions of work under article 7, since the gender pay gap continued to affect women in STEM fields. Such problems were detrimental to the full enjoyment of women's rights under article 15 of the Covenant.

39. In respect of education, 262 million girls were not in school, and much fewer women than men obtained STEM degrees, despite the fact that in 80 per cent of the countries of the world females outnumbered males among graduates. Moreover, girls were often brought up to believe that STEM disciplines were masculine subjects and that their ability was inferior in those areas, despite the absence of any factual basis for such beliefs. That undermined girls' interest and willingness to engage in STEM education. The low percentage of female STEM graduates affected both developed and developing countries. Women's transition into the workforce depended on factors such as female identity, family obligations and working conditions; only a few countries had achieved gender equity in terms of overall labour market participation. Moreover, STEM-specific data on women in education was not widely available. Data on employment too was lacking in some countries, making it difficult to track women's progression from secondary education through tertiary education and into the workforce. However, it was thought that women were more likely than men to leave STEM education after completing their bachelor's or master's degrees.

40. In conclusion, her organization recommended international cooperation efforts to achieve gender parity at all levels of STEM education and employment in all countries; the adoption of national legislation, policies and practices to ensure that all women and girls had equal access to — and were encouraged to pursue and contribute to — scientific knowledge; the public availability of scientific research, at no cost; equal opportunities for female scientists to join and lead national and international scientific advisory bodies; and measures to stimulate girls' interest and confidence in science and to encourage them to pursue scientific education.

41. **Mr. Frick** (Treatment Action Group) said that his organization worked with research and policy institutions and with communities of people affected by epidemics of HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and the hepatitis C virus in order to expand and accelerate research

to end those diseases. It had witnessed both the transformative impact of scientific advances supported by States and the grave harm that resulted from States' inattention to the development and diffusion of science. In his view, article 15 (2) of the Covenant advanced a concept of access. The concept connected State support for scientific innovation with the obligation for all States to ensure that all people enjoyed the benefits of science and its applications, and that such benefits would be lasting.

42. Access was important not only for scientists, who should be able to make use of the means, materials and methods required for scientific discovery, but also for participants in research and the intended beneficiaries of science, who should not be assumed to be consumers in a market sense. He supported Farida Shaheed's assertion that "innovations essential for a life with dignity should be accessible to everyone, in particular marginalized populations". In that vein, the exclusion of children, pregnant women, people with HIV and drug users from clinical studies meant that groups at risk of tuberculosis, for example, were unable to benefit from new scientific applications. Their exclusion resulted in a lack of evidence to recommend the use of such applications for members of those groups. Participation was indeed a key component of access.

43. States should invest sufficient resources in the development and diffusion of science in ways that met the needs of poor and marginalized groups which were not addressed by market-based approaches to innovation. Lastly, he drew the Committee's attention to the recommendations contained in the final report of the Secretary-General's High-Level Panel on Access to Medicines.

44. **Mr. Fernández Puyana** (University for Peace) said that peace was a prerequisite for the exercise of rights and for development, since political instability, civil wars and inter-State conflicts entailed the curtailment of educational processes and the absence of interest in scientific research. Solid institutions laid the foundations for the development of science, while democratic governance provided the conditions required for human rights to flourish, including the rights to education and scientific development.

45. **Ms. Vaudo Scarpetta** (Science for Democracy) said that her organization focused on the inclusion of girls and persons with disabilities in STEM education. She said she would like to have more information on the source of the data indicating that women were underrepresented among STEM graduates in European countries and asked why fewer girls took STEM subjects in countries with more gender equality and a more favourable jobs market for women.

46. **Mr. Kerdoun** said that he was eager to know whether the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress might allow for the transfer of science and technology to poor countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Recalling that previous efforts to transfer technology from developed countries to developing ones had failed to bear fruit, he wondered whether scientifically and technologically powerful States would actually permit the transfer of technologies. It was clear that some market actors, such as the pharmaceutical industry, did not make new inventions widely accessible. The failure to transfer technology had inhibited development and job creation in developing countries and was a contributing factor in the recent wave of migration to Europe.

47. **Mr. Uprimny** (Facilitator for panel 2) said that Panel 2 would resume in the afternoon meeting, when the panellists and Committee members would further discuss the questions raised.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.